### Elections: Plan popular/Link Turn

#### HSR has bipartisan support – official immediate benefits, manufacturing jobs, federal investment.

DOT – Department of Transportation blog – 4/06/11, Benefits of high-speed rail draw a crowd, DOT, http://fastlane.dot.gov/2011/04/high-speed-rail-applications-draw-a-smart-crowd.html#.UBWNEWHLwy4

April 06, 2011 Benefits of high-speed rail draw a crowd Since the Department of Transportation announced the availability of an additional $2.4 billion for high-speed rail projects last month, governors and members of Congress from both major parties have been clamoring for the opportunity to participate. As of our Monday deadline, we received more than 90 applications from 24 states, the District of Columbia, and Amtrak. The preliminary total of those requests is nearly $10 billion, more than four times what we have available. Why is demand for high-speed rail support so high? Because elected officials have seen the immediate benefits of jobs where rail work has already begun. They've seen these jobs in Maine--where the Downeaster extension to Brunswick is under construction--and they've seen them in Illinois--where 96 miles of track are now being laid for the Chicago-St. Louis high-speed corridor. Demand is high because these leaders--Democrats and Republicans--have also seen the expanded manufacturing activity in Indiana, where the workers of Steel Dynamics are forging track. They know that 30 other manufacturers and suppliers have agreed to build or expand operations in the U.S. should they participate in high-speed rail projects. They know that our Buy America requirements ensure they'll be using American-made supplies and materials, so U.S. companies, workers, and communities will receive the maximum economic benefit of our high-speed rail investment.

### Solvency

#### Investment in HSR is the best way to stir economic development.

Eric C. Peterson - Consultant, Lead Writer for APTA (American Public Transportation Association) – July 2012, “Opportunity Cost of Inaction High-Speed Rail and High Performance Passenger Rail in the United States, APTA, http://www.apta.com/resources/reportsandpublications/Documents/HPPR-Cost-of-Inaction.pdf

Chapter 3: Public Transportation and Economic Development Benefits from HPPR¶ Public transportation and HPPR are highly complementary, and if integrated can provide a seamless means to ¶ travel from an origin to a destination conveniently and economically. Together, HPPR and transit are a ¶ welcome combination that improves mobility, and enables the traveler to maximize the use of his/her time ¶ while having minimal impact on the environment and limiting the use of environmentally damaging fossil ¶ fuels.¶ As Paris, London and Tokyo, to name a few, have experienced, HPPR is simply the longer distance, higher ¶ speed extension of a transit system that may include community circulators, cross-town bus service, bus rapid ¶ transit, trolley, light rail and/or heavy rail service, and/or commuter rail service. The linkage of transit to HPPR, ¶ just as the linkage of transit to aviation and roadways, adds value to both modes, enhances the mobility of ¶ travelers, and offers the opportunity for greater economic development than any single mode by itself could ¶ generate. The cost of not building HPPR as part of a highly integrated transportation system is the loss of these ¶ benefits. ¶ (“Next Stop California: The Benefits of High-Speed Rail Around the World and What’s in Store for California,” CALPIRG Education¶ Cost Savings Items (million of dollars – 2012 present value):¶ Highway Congestion Delay Savings $8,676¶ Annual Time Savings $3,137¶ Average Annual Fuel Savings $1,500¶ Annual Emissions Savings $1,850¶ Total $15,163 PAGE 21 APTA Policy Development and Research¶ Opportunity Cost of Inaction: High-Speed and High July 2012¶ Performance Passenger Rail in the United States¶ Fund, June 2010)¶ A 2009 study, “Intermodal Surface Public Transport Hubs: Harnessing Synergy for Success in America’s Urban ¶ and Intercity Travel,” by Lyndon Henry and David L. Marsh observed that: “Promoting intermodal ¶ coordination among various public transport services has been a nominal goal of federal policy at least since the ¶ passage of the groundbreaking Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991. ¶

#### HSR will receive strong ridership – people love public transportation, empirics, access to new riders.

Eric C. Peterson - Consultant, Lead Writer for APTA (American Public Transportation Association) – July 2012, “Opportunity Cost of Inaction High-Speed Rail and High Performance Passenger Rail in the United States, APTA, http://www.apta.com/resources/reportsandpublications/Documents/HPPR-Cost-of-Inaction.pdf

 Henry and Marsh noted that the National Commission on Intermodal Transportation (NCIT) – a body ¶ established under ISTEA – identified intermodal connectivity in public transport is a challenging but critical ¶ need: ¶ “In the passenger system, just as in the freight system, poor modal connectivity is a significant ¶ barrier to intermodalism. Too often, the bus station is 10 blocks from the commuter rail station, ¶ or the transit line stops at the airport, but too far away to walk to the terminals.¶ “Among the benefits of effective intermodal coordination the NCIT identifies were: ¶  Lowering transportation costs by allowing each mode to be used for the portion of the trip ¶ for which it is best suited; ¶  Increasing economic productivity and efficiency, thereby enhancing the Nation's global ¶ competitiveness; ¶  Reducing the burden on overstressed infrastructure components by shifting use to ¶ infrastructure with excess capacity; ¶  Generating higher returns from public and private infrastructure investments; ¶  Improving mobility for the elderly, disabled, isolated, and economically disadvantaged; ¶  Reducing energy consumption and contributing to improved air quality and environmental ¶ conditions.”¶ Henry and Marsh further noted that,¶ “Passenger intermodalism has shown some signs of progress since passage of ISTEA.¶ “Bus and rail transit systems more often coordinate schedules and farecards. Amtrak and ¶ intercity bus lines are recognizing the need to provide coordinated schedules and interline ¶ ticketing, and multimodal passenger stations are on the drawing boards around the country. ¶ “Intermodal surface public transport stations represent a rapidly evolving and developing ¶ concept, designed to provide a hub for interfacing and interconnecting a variety of intercity, ¶ regional, and local public transport systems, all within a single facility. These include: ¶ • Intercity motor coach (e.g., Greyhound, Amtrak Thruway) ¶ • Intercity passenger rail (Amtrak) ¶ • Regional bus and passenger rail ¶ • Local bus, rail transit, and other local-area modes ¶ • Access to shuttle vans and taxis (and often, park & ride facilities for personal motor vehicles)“¶ (“Intermodal Surface Public Transport Hubs: Harnessing Synergy for Success in America’s Urban and Intercity Travel,” Lyndon Henry ¶ – Data Analyst, Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority • Austin, Texas, David L. Marsh – General Manager, Capital Area Rural ¶ Transportation System • Austin, Texas, 2009)PAGE 22 APTA Policy Development and Research¶ Opportunity Cost of Inaction: High-Speed and High July 2012¶ Performance Passenger Rail in the United States¶ Chief among Henry and Marsh’s findings were that:¶ “Public transportation providers can benefit from the efficiencies of shared costs and operational ¶ infrastructure, and public transportation services benefit from smoother intermodal interfaces ¶ and travel route connection opportunities that tend to promote higher ridership. Likewise, ¶ passengers benefit from improved systemwide connectivity and the greater convenience this ¶ affords in making connections among local, regional, or intercity travel. ¶ “Such ground-transport intermodal hubs have the particular advantage that they typically ¶ provide service into or at the edge of the core areas of central cities, and thus facilitate access via ¶ a multiplicity of local and regional transit route options. ¶ “In addition, intermodal public transport hubs tend to be strong attractors for transit-oriented ¶ development (TOD), often being transformed into destinations in their own right.” ¶ (“Intermodal Surface Public Transport Hubs: Harnessing Synergy for Success in America’s Urban and Intercity ¶ Travel,” Lyndon Henry – Data Analyst Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority • Austin, Texas, David L. ¶ Marsh – General Manager, Capital Area Rural Transportation System • Austin, Texas, 2009)¶ In its 2007 report to the National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission, the Passenger ¶ Rail Working Group noted that the anticipated demographic changes of the American population and the ¶ resurgence of urban centers suggest that public transportation and intercity passenger rail will play an ¶ important role for the growing segments of population who cannot or choose not to drive or fly. ¶ (“Vision for the future U.S. intercity passenger rail network through 2050,” Passenger Rail Working Group of the National Surface ¶ Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission, December 6, 2007)¶ According to the American Public Transportation Association (APTA), “Americans took 10.4 billion trips on ¶ public transportation in 2011, the second highest annual ridership since 1957.” ¶ (American Public Transportation Association news release, March 12, 2012) ¶ Interestingly, while virtually all areas of the nation witnessed this growth, many of the leading growth areas ¶ were also areas that are promoting improvements to their intercity passenger rail service as well. This is a clear ¶ indicator that the demographic trend is moving back toward more highly integrated public transportation. ¶ At the same time, the age cohort younger than 35 is, according to the latest U.S. Census data, prefer a ¶ transportation system that provides good options and choices for their various trips. They are more inclined, ¶ where possible, to rely on public transportation, intercity passenger rail, and the airways to serve their ¶ transportation needs. (“National Household Travel Survey (NHTS),” U.S. Department of Transportation, ¶ Federal Highway Administration, 2009)¶ Indeed, the 2009 NHTS shows that since 2001 the share of trips in private vehicles has dropped while the share ¶ of trips on public transportation has grown for the age groups of 16 – 49 and 65+. For those who are not ¶ conveniently situated near public transportation, including intercity passenger rail, mobility has been ¶ significantly impaired. Still, according to Transportation for America, in 2009, seniors accounted for 9.6 percent ¶ of the more than 10.3 billion trips taken on public transportation in the United States. Over all, seniors made ¶ 328 million additional trips by transit in 2009 compared to 2001.¶ (“Aging in Place, Stuck without Options: Fixing the Mobility Crisis Threatening the Baby Boom Generation,” Transportation forPAGE 23 APTA Policy Development and Research¶ Opportunity Cost of Inaction: High-Speed and High July 2012¶ Performance Passenger Rail in the United States¶ America, http://t4america.org/resources/seniorsmobilitycrisis2011)¶ Additionally, Amtrak continues to enjoy steady growth in ridership. The national passenger railroad carried ¶ more than 30 million passengers in 2011, setting another new record for eight of the past nine years. ¶ (“Amtrak on Pace to Set New Ridership Records,” Amtrak press release, April 11, 2012) ¶ To take full advantage of the integration of HPPR with public transportation, cities like London have pursued regeneration strategies ¶ that promote agglomeration – the creation of catchment regions that extend the reach of urban transit systems that link economic¶ activities to labor markets. ¶ (“High-Speed Trains and the Development and Regeneration of Cities,” Greengauge 21, June 2006) (“High-Speed Rail Development ¶ Programme 2008/9, Final Report for Workstream 2,” Systra (2009) ¶ Agglomerative strategies also produce environmental benefits. Even at existing levels of modal integration in ¶ 1997, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) found that ¶ levels of transit use annually avoid about 125 million pounds of hydrocarbons and over 150 million pounds of ¶ nitrous oxides that would otherwise be emitted by automobiles. ¶ (“High-Speed Ground Transportation for America,” U.S. Department of Transportation, September 1997)¶ Transportation accounts for nearly one-third of U.S. carbon dioxide emissions. According to the American ¶ Public Transportation Association (APTA), public transportation in the United States saves 4.2 billion gallons of ¶ gasoline and about 37 million metric tons of carbon dioxide annually. Note that this is based on existing levels ¶ of transit use. There will be additional efficiencies as ridership trends continue.¶ Building HPPR that is highly integrated with other transportation modes, most especially public transit, offers ¶ the United States the opportunity to launch an economic revolution that can offset all the disadvantages and ¶ challenges that beset the nation due to crippling congestion on its highways, bewildering delays and even loss ¶ of air service at its airports, and the demographic dynamics of an aging and increasingly urban population.¶ The objective is not to put HPPR in competition with other modes of transportation, but to establish HPPR as a ¶ complementary mode, offering travelers another option for mobility.¶ As documented in other sections of this report, improvements in intercity passenger rail, in terms of speed, ¶ frequency and reliability, have had dramatic impact on mode choices and demand. Additionally, many ¶ countries with improved intercity passenger rail service have experienced growth in the numbers of induced ¶ travelers – people who may not have traveled before by any mode, but have found HPPR a welcome travel ¶ option. ¶ (“A profile of high-speed railways,” Australian Government, Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local ¶ Government, November 30, 2010)¶

#### HSR happens quickly – benefits are seen almost immediately, empirics prove.

DOT – Department of Transportation blog – 4/06/11, Benefits of high-speed rail draw a crowd, DOT, http://fastlane.dot.gov/2011/04/high-speed-rail-applications-draw-a-smart-crowd.html#.UBWNEWHLwy4

¶ April 06, 2011 Benefits of high-speed rail draw a crowd Since the Department of Transportation announced the availability of an additional $2.4 billion for high-speed rail projects last month, governors and members of Congress from both major parties have been clamoring for the opportunity to participate. As of our Monday deadline, we received more than 90 applications from 24 states, the District of Columbia, and Amtrak. The preliminary total of those requests is nearly $10 billion, more than four times what we have available. Why is demand for high-speed rail support so high? Because elected officials have seen the immediate benefits of jobs where rail work has already begun. They've seen these jobs in Maine--where the Downeaster extension to Brunswick is under construction--and they've seen them in Illinois--where 96 miles of track are now being laid for the Chicago-St. Louis high-speed corridor. Demand is high because these leaders--Democrats and Republicans--have also seen the expanded manufacturing activity in Indiana, where the workers of Steel Dynamics are forging track. They know that 30 other manufacturers and suppliers have agreed to build or expand operations in the U.S. should they participate in high-speed rail projects. They know that our Buy America requirements ensure they'll be using American-made supplies and materials, so U.S. companies, workers, and communities will receive the maximum economic benefit of our high-speed rail investment. ¶ And demand is high because they can't ignore the economic development that rail corridors deliver. They've heard about the success of Brunswick Station, where private investment has already helped generate a number of businesses, condominiums, a new hotel, and a modern medical center. They've heard about the 240 acres under redevelopment near the Sacramento Intermodal Transportation Facility, and the transit-oriented land-use planning that centers on San Jose's Diridon Station. They've heard about towns seeking high-speed rail stops so businesses will plant roots, confident that they have access to a 21st century transportation option that helps them compete in the global economy. From Maine to the Midwest to California, construction has begun on America's high-speed rail facilities, and we can't afford to see this train turn back.

#### HSR key to long term economic growth.

DOT – Department of Transportation blog – 4/06/11, Benefits of high-speed rail draw a crowd, DOT, http://fastlane.dot.gov/2011/04/high-speed-rail-applications-draw-a-smart-crowd.html#.UBWNEWHLwy4

By 2050, our population is expected to grow by another 100 million people. That's nearly a third more than we have now--roughly the equivalent of adding another California, New York, Texas, and Florida. And those people will need to get to jobs, schools, grocery stores, and from city to city, adding tens of millions of cars to our already congested roadways. They will need goods and services, adding trucks. If we refuse to plan ahead, our commercial arteries will be constricted, preventing businesses from moving goods to markets and choking our economy. Today, our Federal Railroad Administration will begin determining which of the more than 90 projects can quickly deliver benefits like sustained economic development, reduced energy consumption, and improved regional transportation efficiency. But while the FRA is reviewing the latest applications, our existing rail investments are already creating jobs, boosting American rail manufacturing, and spurring economic development. And rail can do these things while also reducing oil consumpttion, greenhouse gas emissions, and road congestion. That's the kind of investment we owe the next generation of Americans. That's the kind of investment that will help this nation win the future

### AT Tradeoff: No link

#### No tradeoff – HSR is meant for COMPLEMNTARY travel to air and auto.

Eric C. Peterson - Consultant, Lead Writer for APTA (American Public Transportation Association) – July 2012, “Opportunity Cost of Inaction High-Speed Rail and High Performance Passenger Rail in the United States, APTA, http://www.apta.com/resources/reportsandpublications/Documents/HPPR-Cost-of-Inaction.pdf

Gin’es de Rus, on behalf of the Joint Transport Research Centre, in Discussion Paper 2008-16, “The Economic ¶ Effects of High-Speed Rail Investment,” offers a “simple cost-benefit model for evaluation of high-speed rail.” ¶ Conceivably, this same model could be used to evaluate HPPR, because ultimately the objective is to evolve ¶ ridership to a level that justifies high-speed rail investment.PAGE 24 APTA Policy Development and Research¶ Opportunity Cost of Inaction: High-Speed and High July 2012¶ Performance Passenger Rail in the United States¶ De Rus suggests that:¶ “The first step in the economic evaluation of this project is to identify how the investment, a `do ¶ something´ alternative, compares with the situation without the project. A rigorous economic ¶ appraisal would compare several relevant `do something´ alternatives with the base case. These ¶ alternatives include upgrading the conventional infrastructure, management measures, road and ¶ airport pricing or even the construction of new road and airport capacity. ¶ “The public investment in HSR infrastructure can be contemplated as a way of changing the ¶ generalized cost of rail travel in corridors where conventional rail, air transport and road are ¶ complements or substitutes. Instead of modeling the construction of HSR lines as a new transport ¶ mode we consider this specific investment as an improvement of one of the existing modes of ¶ transport, the railway. Therefore, it is possible to ignore total willingness to pay and concentrate ¶ on the incremental changes in surpluses or, alternatively, on the changes in resource costs and ¶ willingness to pay.¶ “The annual social benefit of the project is the annual gross social benefit of introducing the high ¶ speed rail in the corridor subject to evaluation, where a `conventional transport mode´ operates. ¶ The main components of the annual social benefit are: time savings from deviated traffic, ¶ increase in quality, generated trips, the reduction of externalities and, in general, any relevant ¶ indirect effect in secondary markets including, particularly, the effects on other transport modes ¶ (the conventional transport mode). Other benefits related to the relocation of economic activity ¶ and regional inequalities are not included in the annual social benefit.¶ “The economic rationale of spending public funds in HSR new lines depends more on its ¶ capacity to alleviate road and airport congestion, and to release capacity for conventional rail ¶ where saturation exists, than in the pure direct benefits of time savings and the net willingness to ¶ pay of generated traffic. Therefore, the justification of investment in HSR is highly dependent on ¶ local conditions concerning airport capacity, rail and road network situation, and existing ¶ volumes of demand. This is what one would expect anyway. The economic evaluation of a new ¶ technology has to compare these local conditions, reflected in the base case, with the `do ¶ something´ of introducing the new alternative of transport.”¶ (Joint Transport Research Centre, Discussion Paper No. 2008-16 revised, Prepared for the Round Table of 2-3 ¶ October 2008 on Airline Competition, Systems of Airports and Intermodal Connections, “The Economic Effects of ¶ High-Speed Rail Investment,” Ginés de Rus, University of Las Palmas, Spain, October 2008)¶ Because there is little data available, it is difficult to identify with dependable specificity the actual economic ¶ benefit to the nation and to the various regions in which HPPR may be pursued. In the alternative, ¶ understanding what these benefits might be, and thus what the cost of not building HPPR might be, is to look at ¶ the potential impact of eliminating existing intercity passenger rail service. ¶ (“Vision for the future U.S. intercity passenger rail network through 2050,” Passenger Rail Working Group of the National Surface ¶ Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission, December 6, 2007)¶ In their paper, “Economic Impacts of Intercity Passenger Rail Service: Evidence from Passenger Surveys,” ¶ Benjamin R. Sperry and Curtis A. Morgan apply a direct measurement technique to both project future benefits PAGE 25 APTA Policy Development and Research¶ Opportunity Cost of Inaction: High-Speed and High July 2012¶ Performance Passenger Rail in the United States¶ if a particular corridor is enhanced by HPPR, as well as identify the impact if current service in the corridor was ¶ discontinued. ¶